REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 3, indicated to be allowable. Therefore, claim 1 should be in condition for allowance.

Claim 8 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 15, indicated to be allowable and, therefore, should, likewise, be allowable.

Claim 17 was allowed, together with its dependent claims.

Claim 22 was rejection under Section 102 over either Naruse or Laming. However, nothing in Naruse indicates a length difference. It is suggested that Naruse teaches a flat spectral response and, presumably, it is deduced from this assertion that Naruse gets a flat spectral response in the same way claimed. However, there appears to be no basis for such an assumption. Moreover, if Naruse is reversed, as suggested by the Examiner, there is no waveguide pair coupled to said output waveguide coupler. Instead, there is only a single waveguide coupled thereto.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 22, based on Naruse, is respectfully requested.

It is suggested that Laming somehow teaches the length difference to create a flat spectral output. But nothing in Laming ever suggests any type of length difference. Moreover, reviewing Figure 5, it is seen that the spectral output that is obtained is not particularly flat. Thus, there is no reason to believe that Laming used the arrangement claimed in the present application. While Laming does talk about spacing out waveguides in paragraph 27, he never talks about any kind of length difference. Given Laming's performance and the absence of any mention of any length difference, there appears to be no basis for the rejection of claim 22 and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 29 was rejected based on Doerr and the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art. There is nothing in the reference which suggests making the primary channel spacing between the first and second waveguides coupled to the first multimode interference coupler different than the secondary channel spacing between the first and third waveguides.

Cited lines 5-13 have nothing to support the asserted rejection. There, it talks about the channel spacing between the coupled adjacent waveguides being reduced so as to cause the corresponding transmission coefficients to overlap. But this does not teach making the primary

channel spacing between the first and second waveguides coupled to the first multimode interference coupler different than the secondary channel spacing between the first and third waveguides. The first and third waveguides are specifically defined with respect to their connections to first and second multimode interference couplers. No such arrangement is anywhere shown in the cited reference or the spacing difference between those specifically defined waveguides with respect to specifically defined multimode interference couplers.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 29 is requested.

Claim 33 was allowed.

Therefore, the application should now be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 27, 2005

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation